Case 2::15 cr-20652-GCS-DRG H00:0:01561 Ffleed 0::2/203/1189 Propoject 0:4206399 IP 965 97. of 47.

Case 2::15-cr-20652-GCS-DRG H00:0:01561 Ffleed 0:52/203//1139 Pgagen 0:42064P0g ID-26682 of 47

Case 2::15-cr-20652-GCS-DRG H01:01561 Ffleed 0:52/203//1139 Prog. gent 0:427064Plg IDP 8:5693 of 47

1 2 Detroit, Michigan 3 Monday, April 30, 2018 4 5 THE CLERK: Case Number 15-20652, Trial Group 6 7 2, Eugene Fisher Corey Bailey, Robert Brown, Devon 8 Patterson, Arlandis Shy, James Robinson and Keithon 9 Porter, and we have Jim Feinberg on the telephone. 10 **THE COURT:** Okay. 11 MR. GRAVELINE: Good afternoon, your Honor. 12 Chris Graveline for the United States. 13 THE COURT: Welcome. MR. SWOR: William Swor on behalf of James 14 15 Robinson. MR. H. SCHARG: Henry Scharg on behalf of 16 17 Eugene Fisher. 18 MR. S. SCHARG: Steven Scharg on behalf of 19 Keithon Porter. 20 MR. MAGIDSON: Mark Magidson on behalf of 21 Arlandis Shy. 22 MR. JOHNSON: Bertram Johnson on behalf of 23 Devon Patterson. THE COURT: Okay. So we're missing --24 25 THE CLERK: Craig Daly.

THE COURT: All right. Do you want to go ahead?

THE CLERK: And Mr. Feinberg is on the phone.

MR. FEINBERG: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: This is set up as a status conference. Mr. Swor?

MR. SWOR: Your Honor, this will be a little choppy because I was busy writing about it. I was going to do this in a formal fashion, but we have some major concerns in light of the series of articles that ran in the Detroit News last week.

You know, there was evidence there. There was not evidence there. There were essentially confessions or what the government is going to argue is confessions, certainly statements against interest, and there was also a lot of material in the articles that were rank hearsay, gossip, speculation, government theory, whether proven or otherwise, accusations of conduct that is not charged in the indictment, and on behalf of Mr. James Robinson, I have been absolutely horrified, and as the series went all week, it was, you know, just one thing after another.

I think it terribly prejudices the defendants. It certainly prejudices Mr. Robinson, and at a minimum, I would want to be severed from the -- obviously the death defendants are not going to consent to an adjournment nor

should they, but I want Mr. Robinson severed. I mean, if nothing else, the passage of time may help us, but certainly immediately in three weeks is immediate as far as I am concerned, and this thing is on -- not only in the paper on the Detroit News website, but I'm told that it's been on Facebook, on Instagram, on Snap Chat. So we don't know yet the scope, but it's horrid.

People are talking about it. People in church are talking about it, and they didn't even know that I was on the case. So the risk to Mr. Robinson is very real, and pictures are worth a thousand words. We saw so many pictures. There were graphics. The government says it did not provide the graphics that were used in the story. Well, they are there just the same, and -- and if the government did -- did not provide them, then the idea that the jury will be tainted by information that is not evidence or the jury pool, and it just really reinforces all the ugly stereotypes and prejudices.

I spoke with Mr. Graveline early in the week, and he assured me that the government had nothing to do with the creation of it, and I take him at his word, but that's not the issue here. I'm not asking -- at this point I'm not asking for a dismissal. If I find out otherwise, I may come back and change that position, but we can't go to trial -- I can't go to trial June 5th in the face of all

of this.

2.0

In addition to that, after our last pretrial here, Mr. Robinson who has been housed at Milan, was kept at Dickerson for awhile, and then inexplicitly shipped up to Sanilac. I didn't -- I didn't realize that he was sent to Sanilac. He was sent to Sanilac, and all of his material, his trial preparation material, his notes, his discovery stayed at Milan, because when I checked with the -- once I found out he was at Sanilac, I called the marshals and said what's going on? No. I found out that he was gone from Dickerson. They told me he was going to -- he had gone to Sanilac, and then I said, well how do I get the stuff, his stuff to get it over to him, and they said, we suggest you don't do anything, because this is only temporary. He may be getting moved.

He's still at Sanilac, and so I had to print out almost another complete set of discovery and get it up to Sanilac, except that he is still short of his notes. Our trial preparation has been significantly hampered, but that's just the disaster that happens in cases like this, although it is a disaster.

You've read the articles.

THE COURT: Actually, I haven't.

MR. SWOR: Well, I'm glad you haven't the articles.

THE COURT: I've been busy.

MR. SWOR: I had airplane time. So the articles go well beyond discovery, go well beyond evidence. The taint for the jury pool is unacceptable, given that the -- and the manner, the graphic manner in which it paints the four death defendants, death eligible defendants and the Seven Mile Bloods, and they found a catchy heading for each story, Death by Instagram, is not something jurors are likely to forget.

THE COURT: I don't know what your experience has been, but mine is I'm always amazed how little the jurors know about coverage.

MR. SWOR: If it were just -- if it were back in the good old days of print media, but we got here the web. We got Facebook. We got, like I said, Instagram, Snap Chat.

Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Robinson, I'm asking the Court to sever us, and I will be filing a motion for bond, and quite frankly, you know, this is not something that should be held against Mr. Robinson, and I'll deal with that in the bond motion, but I suppose the Court can find because of the circumstances that this clock should stop, that should not be -- the speedy trial clock should not be a reason to deny us severance, and it doesn't require the defendant's consent. There's nothing in the

Speedy Trial Act that -- and I don't know where that habit has come from, but I don't want to do this, getting into an argument with the government.

This is not about, you know, how the paper got ahold of these things, because that's not productive right now. That may be productive for another hearing, but for the immediacy, my client can't go to trial on June 5th in this environment, and he shouldn't go to trial with people that were really in different situations. The evidence is totally different, and if I filed a written motion, I would have done this a little more intelligibly, although we know there's always danger with me about understanding what I'm talking about it, but it should not go forward.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. H. SCHARG: Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Fisher, I understand exactly what Mr. Swor said, and I concur with him because Mr. Fisher is in the same situation. Mr. Fisher simply put, is being charged as warehousing weapons. He wasn't involved in any of the shootings or in any of the other violent crimes. The government charges that he, in fact, warehoused weapons at his house that were used in different offenses, but never put him directly participating in any of those crimes, and for the same reasons that Mr. Swor detailed, these are articles that have been extremely prejudicial to him and

his ability to be tried at this time.

The Court does have a remedy though. Even if the Court grants a severance to those defendants that are not death eligible, it's not creating another trial because you already have a third group trial scheduled for after the second group. So it's not creating a new trial. It's just placing those defendants that are -- were not death eligible into the third category, which would resolve all of the issues that I think we have in this case.

THE COURT: There's another element here, and that is for death eligible defendants, there has not been any indication from Justice whether they are going seek the death penalty or not. It has occurred to me that we may not hear from them given the state of affairs for D.C., and my expectation was that if we get to the trial and we have had not a response, then there's no death penalty for those defendants because will be --

MR. H. SCHARG: Right. But what I'm saying is in terms of death eligible that's because they are charged with more serious crimes than Mr. Swor's client and my client. I'm referring to them as death eligible at this time because they are charged -- even if they are not authorized, they are charged with violent crimes. They are charged with murders. They are charged with shooting an individual in front of his children, and he's going to

come in in a wheelchair. They are charged with these shootings at a parole office, at a baby shower. They are in a different class than my client and Mr. Swor's I believe, and the fact that my client is not being charged as being directly involved in any of these shootings or violent acts, put them in the separate category.

The news articles did what the government wouldn't be able to do at trial, which was to put them altogether in the minds of the jury.

Again, the death eligible defendants have a whole different agenda, and there is a remedy for this to put us in the last grouping, Group Number 3, which the Court has not -- I don't believe the Court has scheduled a trial dated for the third group.

THE CLERK: January 8th.

MR. H. SCHARG: January 8th.

THE COURT: Your argument is to keep the death eligibles in this group?

MR. H. SCHARG: Yes, in Group 2, and move the non-death eligible into the third grouping for the reasons that I've stated, and Mr. Swor stated.

THE COURT: Okay. At some point I'm going to want to hear from Mr. Graveline. Do you have reaction?

MR. GRAVELINE: Just doing the math, your Honor, I believe we have seven defendants in Trial Group

3.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GRAVELINE: If we move people back, we're creating a trial group of potentially nine, if not 10 people, which then necessitates yet another trial. So to say it's not going to create another trial, I think it would. We can all hope that we work out some pleas and things start working out, but that's the trial group that we would be creating for January.

In terms of the death penalty, I know it's been forwarded on out of the capital case unit up to the deputy attorney general, and they know of the May 10th plea cutoff, and so I'm hoping to have answers no later than May 10th.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. GRAVELINE: That's the status of the four individuals who still face death eligible charges.

THE COURT: So from the deputy to the attorney general to --

MR. GRAVELINE: Those are the only two who review. So normally in this review process it goes to the capital case section. They review it. Once their review is done, it is forwarded to the deputy attorney general, and then from the deputy attorney general to the attorney general. So it's at the top levels right now, and that

was to have been accomplished by last Thursday.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks. Mr.

Magidson?

MR. MAGIDSON: Thank you, Judge.

Well, I don't want to be redundant here. I echo the concerns of brother counsel. Mr. Shy is death eligible, and I spoke with him today just to get his input. They were -- obviously, he's detained, and he's aware of some of the news articles. He was not aware of the details. So I shared it with him. I brought him a copy of the headlines, and it's beyond headlines. It goes on to various jump pages of a lot of details, details which I questioned -- or he questioned as to whether or not this reporter, who is apparently an investigative reporter -- at least investigates one side -- was able to glean certain facts that went beyond the indictment and some of pleadings that were found, particularly since a lot of information in the first trial didn't come up much about some of the other defendants.

So the paper outlines like the key figures. So it tells us who the key figures are with pictures, and then it goes through Mr. Shy's -- what they call a rap sheet.

Not rap song, but rap sheet -- and it talks about multiple arrests and multiple convictions in Michigan, West

Virginia, and it leads somebody to think that this guy

must be the worst person around when, in fact, he was never sentenced as part of any of conviction to a day in jail or let alone prison. So it distorts everything.

So we find the timing unusual, this news breaking story about a case that's been pending for years, falling on the eve of trial after the government's -- you know, maybe I don't want to say less successful, but I'm sure the government was not pleased with the outcome of the first case, acquittal and hung jury, and on the eve of trial where people are death penalty eligible this.

So frankly, my client has been locked up so long, and I'm sure the Court is aware of his position in term of adjournments and things, he doesn't want an adjournment, but it's his position that the government has at least, if not sponsored this or encouraged this reporter from the Detroit News to publish this article, to gain a tactical advantage at the expense of Mr. Shy, and I don't know the remedy. I don't have a remedy short of having some sort of evidentiary hearing to see whether or not the government actually intended to do this, and to establish prosectorial misconduct, in which case the remedy would be dismissal of the indictment.

But short of that, I can't get a retraction. It's on the worldwide web in a million different ways, and Henry mentioned or Bill mentioned something about they

were talking about it in church. I just ran into people -- I'm in the Ford Building, and some of the people, just the workers in the building, talking about it, and just didn't know that I was involved in the case, and I heard them talking about it.

So it resinated at least with a number of people. Like the Court says, you're always surprise how little jurors are aware of what's going on, but for some reason this article with these salacious, if you will, facts involving detailed incidents, much of which are disputed, people have, I think, have adopted this and have internalized this.

So short of what I have suggested, I don't have a remedy. I do know that the people who are death eligible are certainly facing a more difficult challenge now than they did before.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. S. SCHARG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Steven Scharg on behalf of Mr. Keithon Porter.

Your Honor, after reviewing the internet and the Detroit News section, my client was quite, quite upset because they have in this article, they mentioned that he was involved in the two shootings on May 1st and May 8th, and they made him look like he was a hitman in this conspiracy, and it's his position that -- both of our

positions is that we don't believe he would get a fair trial, and I don't know what the -- he does not want an adjournment of this trial date, but he's indicating to me based on this article, it's -- how could he get a fair jury? We don't know what the jurors actually really know, how they are feelings are regarding this situation, but it puts Mr. Porter in a horrible limelight as a result of the accusations and allegations that were made in these reports.

They had in the article about his prior convictions, about his brother, family member. They went into depth regarding Mr. Porter's participation with Billy Arnold, and we believe at this time there is no way that he can get a fair trial on June 5th.

THE COURT: Okay. Well -- yes.

MR. SWOR: The other problem is simply because of the graphical nature of the images, the stories, it will be harder for people who have seen to unremember. It will be -- it is possible that jurors will not recall the story until some of the graphics go up on the screen, and may not consciously remember, but subconsciously remember.

And the other problem that I simply have is that my client -- I mean, it is a real problem for us. First of all, he's an hour and half now at Sanilac. He's an

hour and a half away, and my schedule has not exactly been 1 2 cleared for me to run back and forth. 3 THE COURT: When was he moved? MR. SWOR: Roughly 10 days after our last 4 status conference. So he's been up there almost a month, 5 6 and I've been up to see him, and but I can't spend -- I 7 got four clients up there. I mean, we're deprived of 8 preparation material. 9 THE COURT: We have to get that cured 10 obviously. 11 MR. SWOR: Obviously. The marshals have been 12 trying. You haven't heard me yell about the marshals, and 13 you know that I do. THE COURT: Well, I'll certainly make inquiry 14 15 after this hearing to see if we can get him moved to Milan. 16 17 MR. SWOR: He was at Milan, and that's where 18 his stuff is. My concern is now that he's been gone long 19 enough, that Milan will administratively pack everything 20 up and mail it, and then we're in a whole different 21 situation. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. SWOR: Because then getting it back in 24 will be a problem, but this is an absolute disaster.

15-20652; USA v. EUGENE FISHER, ET AL

THE COURT: Well --

25

MR. SWOR: The timing is certainly horrible.

THE COURT: Yeah. All right. Well, my take on this is that people in general are -- I was looking at -- I was looking at the one print copy that I had, which was on Sunday, maybe last Sunday in the Detroit News, and this is -- with the number of defendants, and the complexity of the case, it seems to me that someone could read that three times, to carefully read it three times, and after the passage of couple of days, couldn't name a person or attribute specific behaviors to an induvial.

We have had a lot of high publicly cases in the district, and if you get a jury, a satisfactory jury in Kwame Kilpatrick's prosecution, I guess you can do it with just about any, and I never -- I didn't hear of any complaints about the jurors who were selected, and we have means to deal with the -- to deal with the publicity. We should undoubtedly ask questions in the juror questionnaire. We should caution them at the time that the questionnaires are received in the mail, not to do any investigation or access social media about the case, and people as a whole I think are pretty conscientious in following instructions that they get.

I mean, you might be absolutely right in that this has received so much attention that the timing of the

trial has to be alter, but I think we only find that out when we get started with the selection process, and we find out what people have seen or heard or remember of the coverage even if they read it. They are not going to be able -- I'm pretty confident that we could fairly sort out the people who really have been impacted. I have had people discuss it in my presence as well. So I do agree with you that this got a lot of attention when it came out, but --

MR. SWOR: But your Honor, if you go to the website now, and I would invite the Court -- and excuse me for interrupting -- but I would invite the Court to look at it online as oppose to just looking at the print page, and looking at the segmented articles and the video that jumps -- I mean, this was -- there are television productions that would envy this, because as you go over them, the images flash and move, and we all studied how those experiments work, and it remains on the Detroit News website's main page. It is there, right there in a big bold black box. So it's not something that fades in time. It's there all the time.

THE COURT: Right, if people are accessing it and watching it. I mean, if we're instructing them at the time these questionnaires go out not to --

MR. SWOR: Damage has already been done

because it paints with such a broadbrush, and condemns anyone associated with the group. That's the problem. It pernicious.

THE COURT: Have you talked to your client about asking for a severance?

MR. SWOR: I spoke with his aunt who speaks to him everyday. I actually -- we already had a discussion about going forward in light of what happened here in the courtroom the last time and my concerns about that and --

THE COURT: You mean, just the client's expression of their determination to get the case tried?

MR. SWOR: It was little more than just a simple expression of determination. As you recall all, with all due respect to the client, this was a rowdy bunch, and they were disrespectful.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SWOR: And when you get backed into a corner -- and so yes. The answer is yes, I have discussed severance with my client even before this came out, and he understands why it may be necessary, and as I said, the Speedy Trial Act does not require a client's consent. It requires a determination by the Court, and I think that given the options available -- and I really don't think there are seven defendants going to trial in January, and

neither does the government, nobody does -- and given the option that the Court has of taking a risk, we're taking a much smaller risk, I think the Court should err on the side of a smaller risk.

MR. H. SCHARG: I also spoke with my client directly, and he, Mr. Fisher, was one who took the initiative and requested that I file a motion for severance, and that was before the news articles, based upon the outburst and circus like atmosphere that occurred at the last pretrial.

As you recall, Mr. Fisher is on bond, and he sat at the defense table, and he had a front row seat of what was going on there, and at that time he voiced his fears to me about going to trial with the others who are death eligible and were sitting in the jury box, and that actually even before the articles came out, I conferred with Mr. Swor because I found out that he had voiced similar concerns.

So my client not only agrees, but he requests that there be a severance, and he be put in the third category.

One more thing, I agree with the Court wholeheartedly that when it comes to trial, that whoever read the articles won't remember names. They won't remember events, but they will remember Seven Mile Bloods being some really bad, dangerous dudes, the most

dangerous, and, you know, the Red Zone.

So they won't remember names. They won't remember events, but when you connect Red Zone and the baddest dudes, the worst violent gang in Detroit, and the fact that they -- that their names won't be published because of the court order, they put two and two together, and what they won't remember is almost more dangerous than what they do.

THE COURT: So we finished a trial recently, and I have the benefit of having talked to the jurors after that trial, and it was obviously they knew from the outset what they were dealing with. They had a general understanding of -- well, there were a couple of people on that jury that had a criminal justice background. So they undoubtedly educated the others, but they had it figured out. The skirting around the tables was used, but if anybody has any level of sophistication, they understand the -- they understood what the case was about. They had -- they were -- still they acquitted one of the defendants, and they were hung on other charges relating to the other defendants.

But I think we underestimate the jurors' capacity to be fair and to avoid -- I mean, we live in a period now where nobody agrees. Nobody agrees with anybody else.

There's a lot of -- lots of leaders and few followers, I

think, these days, and I think that's reflected in the jury, the jurors that we end up to hear these cases.

So I just don't know what else we can do but to try to get a fair jury, and to be liberal in excusing those who have been exposed in a serious way, and probe with probing questions, I think we can assess your concerns with the jurors' background without adjourning and having them to sit in custody for another year or two before case is tried.

So I hope we don't have seven going to trial because I think it's going cumbersome, and I haven't asked for an estimation of the time required.

MR. GRAVELINE: Just in response to Trial Group 3, we know there's three for sure going, and that's the three who were just had a hung jury. I can tell the Court, I've had no conversation with Mr. Martez Hicks' attorney. Jeffaun Adams, who is the brother of Jeffrey Adams, I think is heading to trial. So there's five for sure in Trial Group 3, and so I am concerned about the numbers in terms of the two trial groups.

Yes, depending on the outcome of this case, that might change, but if there's a similar result or acquittal, then guess what? I would imagine that we will have a full seven or eight people come January as well.

So to sit here and say well, depending on what the

result is, we don't know what the result will be, and so that's the difficulty the government finds itself in right now just in terms of -- from the government's viewpoint, I think the Court is correct. We don't know the impact that any of these stories have had until we get actual jurors in here, we see what they put on their questionnaire, we talk to them in voir dire, and then we're actually able to assess what impact whatsoever these articles have had.

And just for complete understanding as well, I mean, the series wrapped up with Michael Rogers being acquitted, and if you go online, there's an interview of Michael Rogers as he walks out the courthouse. So it's not as if this article is all one-sided as well, and so it lays out what the defendants' arguments were. It includes the fact that Mr. Rogers was acquitted. We just don't know.

So I think what we have to do is go through the voir dire process, and we'll be in a much better position to judge what, if any, impact it had, and what any remedy would be because of that impact.

THE COURT: What's your estimation of the time required for trial if all of these defendants now scheduled?

MR. GRAVELINE: I'm planning on two and a half months, your Honor. So approximately 10 weeks.

MR. RATAJ: Your Honor, may I be heard 1 2 briefly? I was not officially invited to the party, and 3 it has to do with the trial date in January with Group 3. I mean, I've heard Mr. Graveline say that. I mean, is 4 that a sure thing that we are in the third group? 5 6 **THE COURT:** We haven't picked a date. 7 MR. GRAVELINE: The only reason I say that is 8 that that's next, Trial Group 3, and I have a month and a 9 half, two month long trial in front of Judge Michelson 10 starting October 5th. So between the time that Trial 11 Group 2 is done here in August, I have a six to eight week 12 long trial in front of Judge Michelson starting 13 October 5th. 14 MR. RATAJ: I quess my question is that -- I 15 mean, is Mr. Graveline correct, your Honor, that myself, Mr. Machasic and Mr. Arnone, are we with Trial Group 3 16 17 now? 18 THE COURT: I have not made that decision. 19 MR. RATAJ: I didn't think you did. That's why I asked. I think I got the answer, the Court has not 20 21 made that decision. 22 THE COURT: No, I haven't. I haven't decided 23 whether I'm going to be around for January and February 24 and March again for this trial. I'm getting too old for 25 this.

MR. RATAJ: Sounds like you're a little under 1 2 the weather. 3 THE COURT: I am. MR. SWOR: Point of information, I already 4 advised your staff, but that week that I alerted the Court 5 6 about my family, it is now become compulsory because I'm 7 hosting a wedding that week. I didn't get to vote on it. 8 THE COURT: This is when? MR. SWOR: This is going to take 10 weeks. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Machasic? 11 MR. MACHASIC: If I may be heard? 12 THE COURT: Sure. 13 MR. MACHASIC: I am fairly confident that 14 whatever group we end up in, will follow the same 15 procedure as Group 2. Given the Court's ruling, the Court has not placed 16 17 an order for a semi-anonymous jury, and in that we are 18 prevented from looking at social media postings of 19 potential jurors. Given this series of articles -- and I 20 21 wholeheartedly disagree with the government that this was 22 some evenhanded treatment -- this was -- I mean, you want 23 to talk about a hit piece, this was a hit piece that did, 24 you know, cursory lip service to fairness in covering both

15-20652; USA v. EUGENE FISHER, ET AL

sides, but that was only cursory.

25

I would like the Court to -- actually, I move that the Court amend the order impaneling a semi-anonymous jury, to provide the names to defense counsel of the potential jurors -- and there can be a protected order that goes along with that regarding further disclosure -- but at this point I think we would be entitled to look at social media for potential jurors to see if they have commented about this case, posted about it. I understand that you can link. So you can link and further distribute these articles. All of these sites work together so that you can pull from one or another. You can take the article from the Detroit News website, and post it to your -- I know it does it for Facebook. I'm not sure it does it for some of the other social media sites. You can Twitter it.

But certainly at this point under these circumstances, given the fact that the Court has decided that we should move forward and see if we can actually get a fair and impartial jury, this is a necessary step in order to guaranty that we have the best shot at a fair and impartial jury, and so on behalf Mr. Adams, I would move that the Court amend that order to then provide the names under protection to defense counsel only, to allow us to then go and find out if people have linked, post or commented about these articles.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Graveline?

MR. GRAVELINE: I would just ask the Court, I would like to take a look what Judge Edmunds did in the Kwame Kilpatrick case to see what they fashioned in terms of the semi-anonymous jury.

I think the Court kind of hit the nail on the head before when you talked about that we have had high profile cases in this district before, the underwear bomber, Kwame Kilpatrick. If that's something that Judge Edmunds and the parties agreed to, I think that would be instructive. I also think how other courts within the building have done that same thing. I would just ask for a day or two to see what protections were in place during that jury selection as well. It doesn't strike me as out there. It's just I would like to take a look how that's been treated before.

**THE COURT:** Okay.

MR. RATAJ: I was in that case, Judge. We fought for that option, but I believe we were denied. So, you know -- but I think, you know, that was like 4-5 years ago, and I can tell you that -- I can told you that this article even appears as an advertisement on Instagram, where if you're on Instagram, it pops up Death by Instagram, and you can go to the link, and go to the series of stories. It is popping up as an ad. So it's

all over the place. I was working out at a gym yesterday, and there's not many bright people in this gym, and they even read the article and commented on it.

MR. EDISON: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Jeffrey Edison on behalf of Martez Hicks, who is in the third group, and I, after learning of this issue that brother counsel was bringing to this Court's attention, I felt that it was necessary to at least appear, and given how fast and quickly technology is evolving as we speak today in April, it may certainly be different by December, and so I would join brother counsel's request for a semi-autonomous jury, and I know that you have to go through another trial in June. So just in anticipation of our trial in January, we would join in that request.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. I do think for the reasons that I discussed earlier that -- and recognizing that we got another couple of -- do we have a couple of months or a month?

MR. GRAVELINE: Approximately five weeks from tomorrow.

THE COURT: I would encourage you to focus on the jury questionnaire, and how we approach the problem in connection with the voir dire to fare out people who may have -- and I suspect there will be some who will, if for no other reason, to get out of jury service, indicate that

they have been affected by the coverage. But I think we got a lot of skillful people in this room, not including me, and you'll have an opportunity for free rein of questioning in connection with this publicity, and I think it can be dealt with, and if it can't be, then we — there's nothing to say that we have to continue with voir dire if we're running into a lot of people who acknowledge reading the material or discussing the material, but as I also said, I think the jurors have evidence that of pretty great capacity for in most cases following instructions from the court, and — go ahead Mr. Swor.

MR. SWOR: I'm just -- you know me I can't sit still. Obviously, my client, death eligible, the cost of being wrong is almost irreparable, because for the four death eligibles, if you -- if we start, and then we suddenly can't find a jury, then all of sudden the government has got another shot at making not only death eligible, but death defendants, and that's a prejudice that I think that we have all have to be aware of, the cost of delay.

You know, my client -- I was going to say the cost of delay to him, give him bond. He's not sitting in jail another year, and he's not accused of any of the murders -- and we'll get into that at the bond hearing -- but I don't think -- well, you made your ruling, but I

just want to point that out that I think we have to be careful.

THE COURT: I think we do too, and so have you collaborated at all on the jury questionnaire?

MR. GRAVELINE: We have, your Honor. I think it is down to one question. Now that was before any of this popped up. So I think it's been Mr. Daly who's taking the lead on that in conversations with me. We're down to one question that quite frankly, the government is objecting to the inclusion of that question. We tabled that for a couple of weeks since we knew we had a little bit of time before the jurors were coming in in mid-March (sic). So that was on the to do list this week, at least for me to reach out to Mr. Daly and talk about what were we going to do with that question, and maybe also what, if anything, anyone wants to have included about this.

It strikes me that touching upon how much people have viewed this particular article probably should be an in person thing rather than a juror questionnaire thing, but I will also leave that up to defense counsel. If we can craft some questions, I'm open to discussion. It just strikes me -- that's my initial thought on it, probably better for in person voir dire than on the jury questionnaire. The jury questionnaire asks what newspaper do you get your information from in a pretty benign way.

So we'll probably know who reads or does not read the Detroit News. That will be helpful to us, but like I said, I'll be open to the suggestion of what's included.

THE COURT: That could be helpful, although if what I'm hearing correctly, it's coming from a lot of different sources that repeat the same material.

MR. GRAVELINE: That's right, and I think we can only fare that out once we start understanding who might or may. For example, the example that Mr. Rataj gave in terms of Instagram. I'm not sure if Instagram is running that because it's name is listed in it or because you clicked on it before.

So sometimes in Facebook, they monitor what articles you put down before, and the running screen on the right hand side will suggest other articles that you may or may not be interested in. So it might depend on, you know, is this something that Instagram pushed out to all of its users or is it suggesting the article because you read one of the previous eight articles.

And so that's why I'm saying is I think at least my initial reaction is, I think that's an in person voir dire as oppose to -- I don't know how we craft enough questions to ask about this or that. I think the initial juror questionnaire as crafted right now will give us clues, someone gets their news from the Detroit News,

somebody gets their news from social media, at least enough then to know that we need to be prompted that this is somebody we might need to dig in a little bit more on in terms of our questioning.

THE COURT: Right. I don't have a problem with dealing with in the courtroom with voir dire, but the -- but if we have the opportunity to head off jurors researching in preparation in anticipation of their big day in court, we should probably include a warning to them.

MR. GRAVELINE: Absolutely. If I understand the process of the court, they are called in, and they are told to fill out the questionnaire in person here. So I think if the Judge wants to be there, if defense counsel wants to be there, but if the Court instructs them, you know, please understand -- you know, we don't have to mention this particular article. So just say, please understand, you're now a juror in this case. You should not do any internet research on a case. You should not do any of this. Not particularly flagging that, I think that's a good and proper instruction that they should receive, the entire jury pool when they come in to fill out the jury questionnaire, and we can work on crafting a statement for the Court to read to that effect as well.

So I'm open to all of those possibilities, and I

think it would be wise to do that.

MR. MAGIDSON: The jury, when they come in as a pool, are they informed of the case?

MR. GRAVELINE: Yes. So the jury questionnaire, like Page 2 says, this is a racketeering case involving the Seven Mile Bloods, particularly these seven defendants with these type of crimes.

MR. MAGIDSON: I think as long as they are going to be informed of the case, then there should be a general question, has anybody heard of this case without being specific as to where or what because there are so many sources, so at least we can flag that right away.

MR. GRAVELINE: I think there is a question that goes to that, have you heard of the Seven Mile Bloods before? Have you had problems with the Seven Mile Bloods?

So without taking up too much more of the Court's time, maybe we all should take a look at the juror questionnaire, and then we'll come back to the Court.

MR. H. SCHARG: But Chris and I and Bill were on the Atari case in front of Judge Roberts, and I believe that we were all summoned to be here when the jury filled out their questionnaires. We were in the courtroom, and they had monitors — television monitors while Judge Roberts went in the jury room and admonished them about not to do any pretrial research, et cetera, et cetera.

THE COURT: This was at the time they are filling out the questionnaire?

MR. H. SCHARG: Judge Roberts went in there before they filled out -- you know, as an introduction before they started to fill out their questionnaires, and defense counsel and the government were in the courtroom watching on monitors as Judge Roberts admonished them about any type, such as, pretrial research, et cetera, et cetera, and then left the room.

THE COURT: This was all on the record?

MR. H. SCHARG: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Was that all on the record?

MR. H. SCHARG: Yes. Judge Roberts left before they initiated going through the questionnaires, and the perspective jurors were free to leave when they completed their questionnaires.

THE COURT: Okay. That sounds like a pretty good way of approaching it.

MR. JOHNSON: Judge, I would just like to add that I concur with all of the arguments of counsel, but I had conversation with Mr. Graveline at the outset, and one thing we did agree on, I believe that there should be some type of remedy. I don't know what that is, but I think we should work together to fashion some sort of process in the selection of this jury that may come down to some

2.0

individual voir dire after we fare out where that may be useful.

I think the trial that you heard has demonstrated that there is a thin line between some of the guilt or innocence of some of these parties. Particularly I'm arguing for Devon Patterson, who I consider with respect to sitting next to death eligible defendants, that he may be a smaller guy when you start talking about that thin line, but the spillover from this prejudice is so great, that I think that it could determine the guilt or innocence of some of these non-death eligible defendants.

So I would ask for some sort of consideration or some degree of individualized voir dire if, in fact, we could work that in and if, in fact, the government, like me and Mr. Graveline, spoke about would agree on some sort of process.

MR. RATAJ: If I may just finish this up,

Judge, because I was in the Atari case too, and my

colleagues and Mr. Graveline can refresh my memory, but I

believe the voir dire was conducted individually.

MR. SWOR: We had individual --

MR. RATAJ: We had individual voir dire.

That maybe something that the Court may want to consider as well.

THE COURT: Right.

1	MR. SWOR: I assume
2	MR. RATAJ: So as a pool, the rest of the
3	people don't get poisoned if somebody goes off the rail.
4	MR. SWOR: In other words, when you're saying
5	"individual," we brought them in individually.
6	MR. JOHNSON: That's what I was speaking
7	about.
8	THE COURT: Right. How long did that take?
9	MR. S. SCHARG: It took us three days.
10	THE COURT: I would be willing to do that.
11	That probably makes sense.
12	MR. RATAJ: Actually Judge Roberts put a
13	table right in front of the box, sat there, and we were
14	all sitting around, and the person was like in front of
15	them.
16	THE COURT: Okay. I don't know that I'll do
17	that. In Macomb County we had Judge Chrzanowski, who
18	didn't want to be on that bench at all. She would be out
19	mingling with the people. Very nice lady.
20	I'm going to be at the Sixth Circuit Conference
21	during the period when they are filling out their
22	questionnaires, and
23	MR. GRAVELINE: I think we could have Judge
24	Hood do it. I mean, she is the chief judge. That gives
25	another veneer of hey, this is pretty common type of court

I'm the chief judge. I'm here welcoming you 1 practice. 2 here. Please know that you need to take your 3 responsibilities seriously. Don't do any research. think if the defense doesn't have any objection, I think 4 Chief Judge Hood --5 6 THE CLERK: She's probably going to be there. 7 THE COURT: We usually have a couple that 8 don't attend. 9 MR. GRAVELINE: So we'll see who's available. 10 MR. H. SCHARG: There's always the magistrate 11 judge. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Sounds good. 13 So nothing new about the death authorization 14 other than it's at the assistant AG? 15 MR. GRAVELINE: That's correct. I hope -and they know of the deadline before the plea cutoff. So 16 17 I hope to have an answer. 18 **THE COURT:** Okay. So if you don't hear by 19 the time the trial is to start, do you agree that we 20 proceed without the death penalty, right? 21 MR. GRAVELINE: I never heard of that. 22 never done any research on that. I would imagine -- I 23 would get myself in trouble saying these things -- I 24 imagine that would constitute some sort of waiver on the

15-20652; USA v. EUGENE FISHER, ET AL

25

Department of Justice.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SWOR: Jeopardy attaches. MR. GRAVELINE: Right. It would strike me, if you're not saying it that you're affirmatively doing it, then that would be some type of waiver. I say all of that, I've never heard of that happening, and I don't know, but I'm going to just stop right there, but we will have an answer before this start starts one way or the other. THE COURT: All right. MR. GRAVELINE: I mean, when I say that, they know of the plea cutoff. They know when the plea cutoff is in this case. MR. MAGIDSON: Will it be a waiver then if we don't have it by the plea cutoff? THE COURT: I would like to set an earlier date. MR. GRAVELINE: That's why -- I'm going to back up. I'm going to back up everything that I just said. I didn't know the operative facts on that. I've never heard of that happening. I understand the ramifications of everybody. I've informed them of the plea cutoff. MR. MAGIDSON: Perhaps the Court can set that date. MR. GRAVELINE: I believe that's the plea

cutoff, and so all I'm saying, I will inform them. They know what the dates are, and it would strike me that ——
let's say for example, that we don't hear anything by May
10th, but they come back on May 17th and say we are going
to authorize on a particular defendant, it would strike me
then that person would be able to sever. We would sever
them out and figure out what we're doing with them like
Billy Arnold. If they came back on May 17th and said
we're not seeking the death penalty on this person, it
would strike me at that point that if this person is still
interested in some type of plea negotiation with the
government, and wants to enter into some dialogue about a
number of years, a charged plea at that point, that we
would still be open to it if the Court is still open to
it.

And so without doing any research, not knowing —
I've never heard of the Department of Justice beginning a
trial and not saying yea or nay. That's why I don't want
to speculate about some type of waiver, but they
understand what May 10th is. They understand that it is
the plea cutoff, and they understand that's the timeline
that we're operating under. They have moved expeditiously
in Washington D.C. upon receipt of everyone's materials,
and I anticipate we will have an answer one way or the
other before May 10th.

MR. H. SCHARG: One more wrinkle for Bill and I, the possibility of Washington authorizing the death penalty on one of the four defendants right before our trial, and that hits the news. That's why I wish the Court would consider moving us to the third trial group to avoid further harm and prejudice.

MR. GRAVELINE: But we don't know that yet. We'll cross the bridges as we cross the bridges I think.

The problem that -- I understand what Mr. Scharg and Mr. Swor are arguing in terms of their defendants, although I tend to disagree -- they are involved in violent acts. I mean, Mr. Robinson is charged during the shooting of Mr. Canady and Anthony Bowen at the baby shower. Mr. Fisher is charged as aiding and abetting the shooting on May 10th, and storing the weapon that was used on May 1st, May 8 and May 10th.

So the problem is we have a pretty full Trial Group 3, even assuming that the other three are not in Trial Group 3. I think we have to just keep moving systematically, and then just take it as it comes. And so we'll see what the next week and a half brings, and I think the Court will be in a better position to make the decisions as necessary.

THE COURT: When the Justice Department did respond by directing the U.S. Attorney to pursue the death

penalty of the first guy, I don't think there was a line written about it.

MR. SWOR: Oh, yes there was. Maybe you were in different town that day or something.

MR. GRAVELINE: Well, I think that's also illustrative of -- the people in this room, the 12 of us lawyers, we know every word that's written about our cases. I'm not sure until we get a jury in here, that they will be as oh, yeah. I would imagine if we brought in 100 people, if you ask if you know about the Justice Department seeking the death penalty against anyone, I bet we would get a lot of shrugged shoulders that they don't know. I think we need to continue to consistently move through it, and we'll find out where we end up here.

THE COURT: All right. We'll do our best.

What else do we've got pending? Mr. Graveline asked to us consider going 9 to 1:30 instead of nine to one like the first time. We also have the option of -- if it makes it easier for jurors to -- I think we had planned a week off in August if it goes that long.

MR. GRAVELINE: We definitely had the week of the July 4th off. I haven't heard about a week in August.

THE CLERK: The week of August 6th, if it goes that far.

MR. GRAVELINE: Maybe what we could consider

is, depending on Mr. Swor's schedule, the end of -THE CLERK: What are your dates?
MR. SWOR: I'll be gone the last week of
July.

MR. GRAVELINE: Well, before we get to schedules and we have a final pretrial with that, and I think we will have all of the defendants here, but in terms of speaking with Jill before the hearing, I think there's two pending motions for bond, Mr. Graham and Mr. Jeffaun Adams. I ask to have until Friday to respond to those, if that's fine, this Friday, May 5th.

I believe there's a motion pending, concerning precluding the government from recall of certain witnesses, i.e., Agent Ruiz multiple times throughout the trial. I would ask the Court if you would consider giving us at least until next Wednesday to respond to that motion, and I think that's all of the pending motions right now, and then have our final pretrial on May 10th.

The only other item that I want to bring the Court's attention, I know the discussion right now is to use Judge Tarnow's courtroom, and I know there's not a whole bench of very good options on this. If we go with seven defendants, I think that courtroom could be pretty tight, especially where the witness box is seated, and I'm not sure if this something where we need the marshals --

2.0

as I remember Judge Tarnow's courtroom, it's very similar to yours, but shorter, and the witness box is right against the defense table. If we have all seven defendants, I would minimally ask the Court to consider moving the witness box to the other side of the room or up against the court's -- I have concerns about witnesses testifying six inches away from some of the people they might be testifying against. That's an issue.

I don't think they are available. I just point out that, for example, Judge Borman and Judge Lawson, I know we've done multi-defendants cases up there, and the jury box -- or the witness box is on the opposite side. Like I said, I don't think they are available, but it is just something to put out there that I think we need to consider about placement of the witness box, how much room needs to be done if it is Judge Tarnow's courtroom that we will be using.

THE COURT: We're going to have a lot of difficulties with that, given the -- you know, all of the judges on this floor are going to be evicted and will be scrounging around for courtrooms.

THE CLERK: Judge Lawson's is not available. We asked.

THE COURT: So who is the other one?

MR. GRAVELINE: Judge Borman.

1	THE CLERK: They are pairings us up with
2	different judges, and it is not hi-tech either.
3	THE COURT: We can explore the possibility.
4	MR. GRAVELINE: I know we're still five weeks
5	out from trial, but that's concern when I heard it was
6	Judge Tarnow's. That's a tight courtroom where the
7	witness box located.
8	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So deadlines
9	for responding to the two motions is reasonable, and we'll
10	address the issues
11	MR. GRAVELINE: So I mean, we have a final
12	pretrial the plea cutoff is May 10th, and so I figured
13	that was the final pretrial.
14	In terms of Mr. Rataj's client Mr. Graham and the
15	bond, I think we have a status conference set for May
16	22nd. Maybe that would be a good time by the time we
17	respond, if he wanted to file a reply, we can do it on May
18	22nd, the bond hearing.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Rataj?
20	MR. RATAJ: Whatever your Honor sets.
21	THE COURT: Okay. We'll do it that way.
22	MR. GRAVELINE: Then with Jeffaun Adams I'm
23	not sure.
24	THE COURT: Okay. All right. If we hear in
25	the meantime from DOJ

1 MR. GRAVELINE: As soon as I hear, everyone 2 will hear. 3 **THE COURT:** Should we reconvene again? MR. GRAVELINE: Sure, if it changes the 4 5 dynamics at all. THE COURT: All right. During jury 6 7 selection, we'll be doing that all day until we get a jury 8 selected, and as it relates to nine to 1:30 or nine to 9 one, do you have a preference? 10 MR. H. SCHARG: Is the option 8:30 to one? 11 MR. GRAVELINE: The only concern with 8:30 is 12 usually jurors and child drop off to school, especially if 13 we get somebody from St. Clair County or Washtenaw County. 14 THE CLERK: It's summer. 15 THE COURT: Daycare would be the only --MR. GRAVELINE: We can be flexible, a five 16 and a half trial day, and then leave it up to what works 17 18 best for the Court, jurors and everyone. 19 THE COURT: The other option that I've never tried, but I've been told by other judges where it seems 20 21 to work well with them, is to go Monday through Thursday 22 and take Friday off okay each week. I'm happy to go 23 whatever you all agree on, and so we'll do the shorten 24 trial day, and just have to figure the preplanned vacation 25 problems.

All right. Anything else? 1 2 MR. GRAVELINE: Nothing from the government, 3 your Honor. MR. SWOR: No. 4 5 MR. H. SCHARG: No. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 8 (Proceedings concluded.) 9 CERTIFICATION 10 11 I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern 12 District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed 13 pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States 14 15 Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the 16 above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. 17 18 I do further certify that the foregoing 19 transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction. 2.0 21 s/Ronald A. DiBartolomeo \_May 23, 2018\_ Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Date 22 Official Court Reporter 23 24 25